Around The Town

Little Facts and Fancies
About
Well-Known Atlantans

"So many people mispronounce the name of the senior Senator from Wisconsin," said Wiliam Schley Howard to-day, "and there really is no difficulty whatever about it. It is pronounced the easiest way imaginable—simply 'La Fo-let.' The accent is on the 'Fol.'"

"So many people undertake to give it a French twist and pronounce it 'La Fol-ay,' while others insist upon 'La Fol-ette,' with the accent on the 'ette.'"

"Both of these pronunciations are out of the ordinary and much harder to get away with than just plain 'La Fol-et!'"

"Really, 'La Fol-et' is all there is to it!"

"Why pigskin?" anxiously and in a hurt tone of voice inquired Johnnie Reese, discussing the football season."

"There isn't and never was a football made of pigskin—I have the word of the best informed footballist in the world as to that. Footballs are made of a sow's skin or calf-skin—that is, the part of them that isn't made of rubber—and yet everywhere that football is talked of, one hears of the 'pigskin' this, that, and the other! How did it start? There is no sense in it. Who first called a football a 'pigskin?'"

Johnnie seemed to be awfully upset about it, and all that, but there was nobody in the crowd who could answer his query or relive his robust indignation, nevertheless.

Charles N. Thompson, an important member of Ringling Brothers Circus staff, spent several hours with his old friend Waiter Taylor, Atlanta's City Clerk, Wednesday on his way from New York to Florida, Cosmopolite that he is, Mr. Thompson immediately began to talk of how Atlanta compared with the other leading cities of the country, as soon as he had given Mr. Taylor the "glad hand" and been duly presented to a group in the clerk's office in the City Hall.

"You know," he began, "the system they have of passing people down to the tracks at the Terminal Station is worse than the way we boys used to beat our way into the main tent when the annual circus came to town."

"The fast Southern New York-New Orleans limited was late to-day, and I suppose there were 150 persons lined up at the gate to pass through. The gatekeeper was sitting to one side on a soap-box and the men in the line had turned up their suitcases and were resting on them. The women just had to stand up. The train rushed in for its brief pause here, and then there was a rush for that gate like the last free lunch in the world was being served!"

Mr. Thompson did not mention the difficulty of getting a pass down on the tracks to meet a friend or to put a woman on the train, but some of the other members of the party did, and with rather bitter emphasis.

"Well," remarked Walter Taylor, "there is one man in Atlanta who gets in everywhere that human beings are supposed to go and that he wants to. He is Dr. W. J. Carnes, and he has a system all his own. He gets there, too, as his presence at the baseball games, theaters, the Frank and other famous trials will prove. I don't know just how he does it, but Dr. Carnes says he 'eases in.'"

PDF PAGE 30, COLUMN 3

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE FRANK CASE

(From the Savannah News.)

It is not surprising that counsel for the defense in the Frank case in Atlanta seized upon the statement of Judge Roan, to the effect that the evidence hadn't convinced him as to the guilt or innocence of the defendant, in appealing to the Supreme Court for a new trial. To say the least, Judge Roan's statement was an unusual one for a trial judge to make. Whether the Supreme Court will consider it of importance in deciding the question as to whether a new trial should be granted remains to be seen. The prosecution, of course, will say that it was the jury's business to decide whether or not the accused was guilty, and that it didn't make any difference whether the judge was or was not convinced of his guilt. The already great interest in the question as to what the decision of the Supreme Court in the famous case will be is increased because of the judge's remark.

Another Issue in the Frank Case.

(From the Macon News.)

Judge Roan's obiter dictum in the Frank case has injected an unprecedented and what many believe is an unwarranted issue in that celebrated, though non the less sordid, court affair.

In overruling the motion for a new trial—an act that required courage, after the vigorously bitter fight made by Frank's counsel to have the trial court upset the Verdict—Judge Roan said:

"Gentlemen, I have thought about this case more than any other I have tried. I am not certain of this man's guilt. With all the thought I have put on this case I am not thoroughly convinced that Frank is guilty or innocent. The jury was convinced. There is no room to doubt that. I feel that it is my duty to order that the motion for a new trial be overruled."

There are some who logically think that if the judge really thought this way about it—and none can question his sincerity—he should have given Leo Frank a new trial. His remarks, to say

the least, put him in the attitude of thinking one way and acting another.

Did Judge Roan Express the Truth?

(From the Augusta Chronicle)

But, after all, did not Judge Roan merely express the truth? Those who are adversely criticizing his honor should stop and think it over.

Judge Roan's Opinion.

(From the Augusta Chronicle.)

Judge Roan displayed very bad taste and worse judgement in expressing an opinion of the innocence or the guilt of the defendant in the Frank case. It was a bad break and the judge was really surprised his friends—Brunswick news.

That to which The News refers is Judge Roan's words in refusing Frank a new trial. He said: "I have given the question long consideration. I have thought about this case more than any other I have tried. I am not certain of this man's guilt. With all the thought I have put on this case, I am not thoroughly convinced that Frank is guilty or innocent. The jury was convinced. There is no room to doubt that. I feel it is my duty to order that the motion for a new trial be overruled."